



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/763,246      | 02/20/2001  | Kenping Xie          | A34032 PCTUS        | 5262             |

21003 7590 05/05/2004

BAKER & BOTTS  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2151

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/763,246

Applicant(s)

XIE ET AL.

Examiner

Hassan Phillips

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) for a PCT application based upon an application 98122785.6 filed in China on April 12, 1998 and an international application PCT/CN99/00166 filed on October 25, 1999. A claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) cannot be based on said application, since the United States application was filed more than twelve months thereafter.

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: line numbers are missing in the disclosure. The examiner suggests adding line numbers in the disclosure in order to better reference specific sections within the disclosure. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 consists of more than one sentence. Claims must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-5, 7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

3. Claim 1 recites the limitations "the addresses" and "the online computers" in line 1, "the full digital code" and "the full digital code address" in line 2, "the online number" and "the telephone number" in line 3, "the category number" in line 4, "the digital number" and "the established network site" in line 5, "the IDDD code" in line 6, "the country", "the user", "the area code", and "the domestic DDD" in line 7, and "the business category" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

4. Claim 2 recites the limitations "the address coding solution", "the E-mail box", and "the Internet" in line 2, "the modem" and "the computer" in line 3, and "the

keyboard" and "the computer" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

5. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the dedicated interpreting software" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. Claim 4 recites the limitation "the subcategory number" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the encrypted digital number" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claim 7 recites the limitations "the said coding solution" in line 2, "the mail box" in line 3, and "the user name digital number", "the domain name", and "the mail server" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

9. In order to complete the review of the application for patent, the examiner has interpreted claims 1-5, and 7, as though they were written in proper form, or had sufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jang et al. (hereinafter Jang), U.S. patent publication 2002/0091754.

3. In considering claim 1, Jang teaches method for assigning addresses to on-line computers by using a combination of numbers comprising:

- a) Selecting any desired numerical combination, such as the telephone number of a site administrator, to assign addresses to on-line computers, (page 2, paragraph 31).

4. In considering claim 2, Jang further teaches:

- a) Browsing the Internet by dialing a telephone number on the keypad of a wireless device 31, (page 2, paragraph 36);
- b) Linking the telephone number to an address and converting the telephone number, (page 3, paragraphs 39-40).

5. In considering claim 3, Jang further teaches interpreting the numerical combinations into IP addresses, or domain names, or a domain name hierarchy system, and each numerical combination corresponding to one existing IP address, or domain name, or a domain name hierarchy system. See page 3, paragraphs 45-47.

6. In considering claim 4, the method of Jang further provides a means for a subcategory number, to come after a category number in a numerical combination. See page 2, paragraph 31.

7. In considering claim 7, it is inherent that the method taught by Jang also provides a means for assigning addresses to mail boxes, wherein the address is composed of a users telephone number and a domain name of the server where the mailbox is located. See page 2, paragraph 31.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang in view of Tavor et al. (hereinafter Tavor), U.S. patent 6,070,154.

3. In considering claim 5, although the disclosed method of Jang teaches substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose:

- a) Encrypting the numerical combination.

Nevertheless, encrypting numbers in on-line transactions was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. This is exemplified in a method taught by Tavor that discloses transmitting Credit card numbers on-line comprising:

- a) Encrypting the credit card numbers before their transmission, (col. 7, lines 65-67, col. 8, lines 1-33).

Given the teachings of Tavor it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Jang in order to encrypt portions of the numerical combination. This would have prevented information, such as a private telephone number, from being accessed by individuals who were not authorized to access such information, Tavor, col. 7, lines 45-50.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang in view of Schutte et al. (hereinafter Schutte), U.S. patent 6,178,455.

5. In considering claim 6, although the disclosed method of Jang teaches substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose:



- a) Assigning dynamic addresses.

Nevertheless, assigning dynamic addresses to temporary on-line computers was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. This is exemplified in a method taught by Schutte that discloses a router assigning addresses to hosts connected to the router comprising:

- a) Assigning static IP addresses to components that are always active, and dynamic IP addresses to components that are not so active, (col. 6, lines 27-35.

Given the teachings of Schutte it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Jang in order to also assign dynamic addresses to temporary on-line computers. This would have provided an efficient means for temporary on-line computers to share a small number of IP addresses among a much larger group of on-line computers, Schutte, col. 6, lines 36-43.

### ***Conclusion***

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jang et al., U.S. patent publication 2002/0091754, discloses a method for assigning addresses to on-line computers using numerical combinations.

Tavor et al., U.S. patent 6,070,154, discloses a method for encrypting credit card numbers for secure transmission over a network.

Schutte et al. U.S. patent 6,178,455, discloses a method for assigning static and dynamic addresses to hosts on a network.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (703) 305-8760. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/  
4/20/04

  
**FRANTZ B. JEAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**